BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT/Debt Increases for Social Security

SUBJECT: A Resolution Proposing a Balanced Budget Amendment to the Constitution of the United States . . . H.J. Res. 1. Hatch motion to table the Graham amendment No. 298.

ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 57-43

SYNOPSIS: Pertinent votes on this legislation include Nos. 62-63, 65-82, and 84-98.

As passed by the House, H.J. Res. 1, a resolution proposing a Balanced Budget Amendment to the Constitution, is virtually identical to the balanced budget constitutional amendment that was considered last year by the Senate (see 103d Congress, second session, vote Nos. 47-48). The resolution: will require a three-fifths majority vote of both Houses of Congress to deficit spend or to increase the public debt limit; will require the President's annual proposed budget submission to be in balance; and will require a majority of the whole number of each House to approve any bill to increase revenue. Congress will be allowed to waive these requirements for any fiscal year in which a declaration of war is in effect. Congress will enforce and implement this amendment by appropriate legislation. The amendment will take effect in fiscal year 2002 or with the second fiscal year beginning after its ratification, whichever is later. The States will have 7 years to ratify the amendment.

The Graham amendment would exempt "increases in the limit on the debt of the United States held by the public to reflect net redemptions from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund" from section 2 requirements. (Section 2 will provide that "The limit on the debt of the United States held by the public shall not be increased, unless three-fifths of the whole number of each House shall provide by law for such an increase by a rollcall vote.")

Debate was limited by unanimous consent. Senator Hatch moved to table the amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

Those favoring the motion to table contended:

This particular Graham amendment, unlike the previous amendment (see vote No. 82), contains all the practical and constitutional

(See other side)

	YEAS (57)			NAYS (43)			NOT VOTING (0)	
Republicans Democrats		Republicans	Der	Democrats		Democrats		
((53 or 100%) (4 or 9%)		(0 or 0%)	(43 or 91%)		(0)	(0)	
Abraham Ashcroft Bennett Bond Brown Burns Chafee Coats Cochran Cohen Coverdell Craig D'Amato DeWine Dole Domenici Faircloth Frist Gorton Gramm Grams Grassley Gregg Hatch Hatfield Helms	Hutchison Inhofe Jeffords Kassebaum Kempthorne Kyl Lott Lugar Mack McCain McConnell Murkowski Nickles Packwood Pressler Roth Santorum Shelby Simpson Smith Snowe Specter Stevens Thomas Thompson Thurmond Warner	Campbell Kerrey Robb Simon		Akaka Baucus Biden Bingaman Boxer Bradley Breaux Bryan Bumpers Byrd Conrad Daschle Dodd Dorgan Exon Feingold Feinstein Ford Glenn Graham Harkin	Heflin Hollings Inouye Johnston Kennedy Kerry Kohl Lautenberg Leahy Levin Lieberman Mikulski Moseley-Braun Moynihan Murray Nunn Pell Pryor Reid Rockefeller Sarbanes Wellstone	EXPLANAT 1—Official I 2—Necessar 3—Illness 4—Other SYMBOLS: AY—Annou AN—Annou PY—Paired PN—Paired	ily Absent inced Yea inced Nay Yea	

VOTE NO. 83 FEBRUARY 28, 1995

infirmities as did the earlier Feinstein, Reid, and Harkin amendments (see vote Nos. 52, 65, and 80). We therefore urge its swift and deserving rejection.

Those opposing the motion to table contended:

We have offered this Graham amendment as our second choice, in case the first Graham amendment is rejected. If we allow Social Security funds to be borrowed by simple majority votes, then we should be able to pay benefits by simple majority votes as well. This amendment would permit the debt limit to be increased by a majority vote if the additional debt were used to pay Social Security benefits. We think this proposal is fair, and merits our approval.